

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA  
MONROE DIVISION**

THE STATE OF LOUISIANA,  
By and through its Attorney General, JEFF  
LANDRY, et al.,

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

XAVIER BECERRA, in his official capacity  
as Secretary of Health and Human Services, et  
al.,

DEFENDANTS.

Civil Action No. 3:21-cv-03970

District Judge Terry A. Doughty

Magistrate Judge Kayla D. McClusky

**PLAINTIFF STATES' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY  
FURTHER PROCEEDINGS**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Defendants have moved (R. Doc. 40) to stay further proceedings in this Court pending interlocutory appeal to the Fifth Circuit of this Court's preliminary injunction. This Court set a deadline for Plaintiff States to respond today, January 14, 2022. Yesterday, the United States Supreme Court issued an opinion in this matter, granting Defendants' request for a stay of the preliminary injunction previously issued by this Court. In light of that ruling, the Plaintiff States submit that a 14-day pause of this matter would be appropriate to permit further evaluation of the ruling issued by the United States Supreme Court.

**II. POSTURE OF THE PROCEEDING**

On November 15, 2021, fourteen Plaintiff States<sup>1</sup> moved for a preliminary injunction to prevent Defendants from implementing and enforcing CMS’ interim final rule, entitled Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Omnibus COVID-19 Health Care Staff Vaccination, 86 Fed. Reg. 61555 (Nov. 5, 2021) (the “Vaccine Mandate”), which requires vaccination of staff by 21 types of Medicare and Medicaid providers subject to Medicare or Medicaid conditions of participation, conditions for coverage, or requirements for participation. R. Doc. 2. On November 30, 2021, this Court granted Plaintiff States’ motion for a preliminary injunction, entering a nationwide injunction (excepting ten states covered by the “Missouri Injunction”<sup>2</sup>) enjoining and restraining Defendants from implementing the Vaccine Mandate. R. Docs. 28-29. The next day, Defendants filed a motion to stay the Court’s ruling pending appeal to the Fifth Circuit, which was denied that same day. R. Docs. 32, 35. On December 2, 2021, Defendants filed a similar motion to stay with the Fifth Circuit, which was granted in part and denied in part. *See Louisiana v. Becerra*, \_\_F.4th \_\_, 2021 WL 4913302 (5th Cir. Dec. 15, 2021). The Fifth Circuit effectively narrowed the scope of the injunction pending appeal, keeping it in place for just the fourteen Plaintiff States. *Id.*

Following the Fifth Circuit’s partial denial of Defendants’ motion for stay, Defendants submitted an application to the Supreme Court seeking a stay of the narrowed injunction. *See Becerra v. Louisiana*, No. 21-A-241 (U.S. application filed on Dec. 16, 2021). Defendants also filed an application in the Supreme Court seeking a stay of the *Missouri Injunction*, after Defendants unsuccessfully moved to stay proceedings pending appeal in both the Missouri district court and the Eighth Circuit. *See Biden v. Missouri*, No. 21-A-240 (U.S. application filed Dec. 16,

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff States include Louisiana, Montana, Arizona, Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Utah, West Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky.

<sup>2</sup> *Missouri v. Biden*, \_\_F. Supp. 3d \_\_, 2021 WL 5564501 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 29, 2021) (enjoining implementation and enforcement of the Vaccine Mandate for ten states).

2021). The Supreme Court consolidated Defendants' stay applications. *See Biden v. Missouri*, \_\_\_S.Ct.\_\_, 2021 WL 6061692 (Dec. 22, 2021). On January 12, 2022, the Supreme Court granted Defendants' motion for a stay of the preliminary injunctions issued by this Court and the Missouri court pending appeals to the Fifth and Eighth Circuits, respectively. *See Biden v. Missouri*, No. 21A240, 595 U.S. \_\_, 2022 WL 120950 (U.S. Jan. 13, 2022).

Defendants seek to stay all further proceedings in this Court pending resolution of the appeal by the Fifth Circuit.

### **III. OPPOSITION TO STAY**

#### **A. Standard for Granting a Stay**

A district court has general discretionary power to stay proceedings before it in the control of its docket and in the interests of justice. *See In re Beebe*, 56 F.3d 1384 (5th Cir. 1995) (citing *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)). “[T]he power to stay proceedings” is “incidental to a district court’s inherent power ‘to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.’” *Id.* However, this control is not “unbounded,” and “[p]roper use of this authority ‘calls for the exercise of judgment, which must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance.’” *Wedgeworth v. Fibreboard Corp.*, 706 F.2d 541, 544-45 (5th Cir. 1983) (quoting *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254-55). The burden is squarely on the party seeking the stay to show “a clear case of hardship or inequity in being required to go forward, if there is even a fair possibility that the stay for which he prays will work damage to someone else.” *See Wedgeworth*, 706 F.2d at 545. Furthermore, “stay orders will be reversed when they are found to be immoderate or of an indefinite duration.” *Id.* (quoting *McKnight v. Blanchard*, 667 F.2d 477, 479 (5th Cir. 1982)).

#### **B. Defendants have failed to make the requisite showing for a stay of proceedings**

Defendants primarily argue that a stay is appropriate because Plaintiff States have not identified any prejudice or hardship that Plaintiff States would suffer due to a stay, and that a stay would preserve the resources of the parties. R. Doc. 40-1 at ¶ 6. But it isn't the States' burden to identify prejudice or hardship.

The Supreme Court's decision plainly contemplates that the litigation will advance in the lower courts.<sup>3</sup> Defendant has shown no reason to thwart that progress. This Court retains jurisdiction over all matters "not involved in the appeal." *Rauscher Pierce Refsnes, Inc. v. Birenbaum*, 860 F.2d 169, 170 (5th Cir. 1988) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1)). "It is the general rule that a district court is divested of jurisdiction upon the filing of the notice of appeal with respect to any matters involved in the appeal. However, where an appeal is allowed from an interlocutory order, the district court may still proceed with matters not involved in the appeal." *Alice v. Dusek*, 492 F.3d 563, 564-65 (5th Cir. 2007) (quoting *Taylor v. Sterrett*, 640 F.2d 663, 667-68 (5th Cir. 1981)). *See also Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.*, 459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982) ("The filing of a notice of appeal is an event of jurisdictional significance—it confers jurisdiction on the court of appeals and divests the district court of its control over those aspects of the case involved in the appeal.").

Defendant has offered no reason for not proceeding with matters in this Court that are not before the Fifth Circuit, such as discovery and resolutions of issues relating to the Administrative Record.

### C. Defendants seek a stay of an indefinite duration

---

<sup>3</sup> For this reason alone, Defendants' reliance on the previous stays issued in the related cases is misplaced. *See Missouri v. Biden*, \_\_F. Supp. 3d\_\_, 2021 WL 5564501 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 29, 2021); *Florida v. Dep't of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 3:21CV2722-MCR-HTC, 2021 WL 5416122 (N.D. Fla. Nov. 20, 2021).

The Fifth Circuit has made clear that stay orders should not be “immoderate or of an indefinite duration.” *Wedgeworth*, 706 F.2d at 545. Yet, that is what Defendants seek. *See McCall v. Peters*, No. Civ.A. 3:00-CV-2247-D, 2003 WL 22083507, at \*2 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 18, 2003) (“Plaintiff also fails to state the potential duration of the requested stay. Thus, granting Plaintiff’s motion at this time would create a stay of indefinite duration.”); *Wedgeworth*, 706 F.2d at 545 (finding a “stay hinged on completion of [other] proceedings...manifestly indefinite,” as a “stay must be ‘so framed in its inception that its force will be spent within reasonable limits, so far at least as they are susceptible of prevision and description.’”) (quoting *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 257).

Although the States do oppose such an open-ended stay, a short-term stay of 14 days would permit time to further review the rulings issued by the United States Supreme Court and evaluate whether the issues can be narrowed.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

Plaintiff States have an interest in the prompt and efficient resolution to this case. Since Defendants have not met their burden to show a clear need for a stay of proceedings pending appeal, their motion should be denied.

Dated: January 14, 2022

AUSTIN KNUDSEN  
Montana Attorney General  
David Dewhirst\*  
Solicitor General  
Kathleen L. Smithgall  
Assistant Solicitor General  
215 North Sanders Street  
Helena, MT 59601  
[David.Dewhirst@mt.gov](mailto:David.Dewhirst@mt.gov)  
[Kathleen.Smithgall@mt.gov](mailto:Kathleen.Smithgall@mt.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Montana*

MARK BRNOVICH  
Arizona Attorney General  
Robert J. Makar\*  
Assistant Attorney General  
2005 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
[Robert.makar@azag.gov](mailto:Robert.makar@azag.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Arizona*

STATE OF ALABAMA  
Office of the Attorney General Steve Marshall  
Edmund G. LaCour Jr.\*  
Solicitor General  
Thomas A. Wilson\*  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
501 Washington Ave.  
Montgomery, AL 36130  
Tel.: (334) 353-2196  
Fax: (334) 353-8400  
[Edmund.LaCour@AlabamaAG.gov](mailto:Edmund.LaCour@AlabamaAG.gov)  
[Thomas.Wilson@AlabamaAG.gov](mailto:Thomas.Wilson@AlabamaAG.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Alabama*

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Elizabeth B. Murrill

ELIZABETH B. MURRILL (La #20685)  
Solicitor General  
J. SCOTT ST. JOHN (La #36682)  
Deputy Solicitor General  
MORGAN BRUNGARD\*  
JOSIAH KOLLMEYER (La #39026)  
Assistant Solicitors General  
LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
1885 N. Third Street  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804  
Tel: (225) 326-6766  
[murrille@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:murrille@ag.louisiana.gov)  
[stjohnj@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:stjohnj@ag.louisiana.gov)  
[brungardm@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:brungardm@ag.louisiana.gov)  
[kollmeyerj@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:kollmeyerj@ag.louisiana.gov)

JIMMY R. FAIRCLOTH, JR. (La. #20645)  
[jfaircloth@fairclothlaw.com](mailto:jfaircloth@fairclothlaw.com)  
MARY KATHERINE PRICE (La. #38576)  
[kprice@fairclothlaw.com](mailto:kprice@fairclothlaw.com)  
Faircloth Melton Sobel & Bash, LLC  
105 Yorktown Drive  
Alexandria, Louisiana 71303  
Telephone: (318) 619-7755  
Facsimile: (318) 619-7744

*Counsel for the State of Louisiana*

CHRISTOPHER M. CARR  
Georgia Attorney General  
Stephen J. Petrary  
Solicitor General  
Drew F. Waldbeser\*  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Ross W. Bergethon  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
40 Capitol Square, S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334  
[spetrary@law.ga.gov](mailto:spetrary@law.ga.gov)  
[dwaldbeser@law.ga.gov](mailto:dwaldbeser@law.ga.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Georgia*

LAWRENCE G. WASDEN  
Idaho Attorney General  
Brian Kane\*  
    Chief Deputy Attorney General  
Leslie M. Hayes  
Megan A. Larrendo  
    Deputy Attorneys General  
700 W. Jefferson Street, Ste. 210  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho 83720-0010  
Telephone: 208-334-2400  
Facsimile: 208-854-8071  
[brian.kane@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:brian.kane@ag.idaho.gov)  
[leslie.hayes@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:leslie.hayes@ag.idaho.gov)  
[megan.larrendo@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:megan.larrendo@ag.idaho.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Idaho*

LYNN FITCH  
Attorney General of Mississippi  
Whitney H. Lipscomb\*  
    Deputy Attorney General  
John V. Coghlan\*  
    Deputy Solicitor General  
State of Mississippi  
Office of the Attorney General  
550 High Street  
Jackson, MS 39201  
Tel: (601) 359-3680

*Counsel for the State of Mississippi*

SEAN D. REYES  
Utah Attorney General  
Melissa A. Holyoak\*  
    Solicitor General  
350 N. State Street, Suite 230  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114  
[melissaholyoak@agutah.gov](mailto:melissaholyoak@agutah.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Utah*

THEODORE M. ROKITA  
Indiana Attorney General  
Thomas M. Fisher  
    Solicitor General  
Indiana Government Center South 302 W.  
Washington St., 5th Floor Indianapolis, IN  
46204  
[Tom.fisher@atg.in.gov](mailto:Tom.fisher@atg.in.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Indiana*

JOHN M. O'CONNOR  
Attorney General of Oklahoma  
Mithun Mansinghani\*  
    Solicitor General  
313 NE 21st Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
(405) 521-3921

*Counsel for the State of Oklahoma*

ALAN WILSON  
South Carolina Attorney General  
Thomas T. Hydrick  
    Assistant Deputy Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
[thomashydrick@scag.gov](mailto:thomashydrick@scag.gov)

*Counsel for the State of South Carolina*

PATRICK MORRISEY  
West Virginia Attorney General  
Lindsay S. See  
    Solicitor General  
State Capitol, Bldg 1, Room E-26  
Charleston, WV 25305  
[Lindsay.s.see@wvago.gov](mailto:Lindsay.s.see@wvago.gov)

*Counsel for the State of West Virginia*

DANIEL CAMERON  
Kentucky Attorney General  
Marc Manley  
Assistant Attorney General  
700 Capital Avenue, Suite 118  
Frankfort, KY 40601  
[Marc.Manley@ky.gov](mailto:Marc.Manley@ky.gov)

*Counsel for the Commonwealth of Kentucky*

DAVE YOST  
Ohio Attorney General  
May Davis\*  
Deputy Solicitor General  
615 W. Superior Ave., 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
[May.Davis@OhioAGO.gov](mailto:May.Davis@OhioAGO.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Ohio*

\**Pro Hac Vice admission application  
forthcoming*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I presented the above and foregoing for filing and uploading to the CM/ECF system which will send electronic notification of such filing to all counsel of record.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this 14<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2021.

/s/ Elizabeth Murrill  
OF COUNSEL